REMARKS

<u>112 Objections</u>

Item 7 - The examiner objected to claims 1, 5, 7, 41 and 46 – see item 7 of Office Action – based on the possibility that the second proxy server can be in the same computer as the first proxy server. The examiner was also concerned about the clarity of the words "placed between the first proxy server and the Internet". This is possible due to any computer having many ports (<u>see, e.g.</u> page 20, line 8 of the original specification). To clarify, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 41 to add commas in the sentence "a second proxy server, without the administrative module or the friendly or the unfriendly lists, placed between the first proxy server and the Internet" in the paragraph beginning "a second proxy …". In addition, the words " have been added to these claims 1, 5, 41. Regarding claims 7 and 46, it is respectfully noted that these claims have no second proxy so the examiner's concern about the location of the second proxy server is inapplicable there.

Items 8 and 9 – the examiner objected to the term "self-configuring". The specification has been amended by Applicant on page 19 to clarify that when it states that "self-configuring is having the power to do the configuring on his own", "his own" refers to the user. This is supported in the specification because the same paragraph on page 19 refers to the self-configuring administrator account to be a user account.

Item 10 – As to claims 2 and 6, the examiner objected to language that the second proxy server *is* a first proxy server. For clarification purposes, claims 2 and 6 have been amended by Applicant to state that the second proxy server has the characteristics of the first proxy server (other than as stated in the claims) rather than that it is the first proxy

server.

Item 11 – In response to the examiner's objections, claims 12, 14, 16, 18 have been amended to state that "a first proxy server is in each and every user computer" and not that *the* first proxy server is in each and every user computer.

Item 12 – In response to the examiner's objection to the phrase "maximum 100% access" and "full suspension", Applicant has amended claims 8, 13, 19-22, 24, 26, 28, 32, 34, 37, 39, 43, 48, 50 to recite "allowing all access" and "allowing no access at all" to the resources on the Internet. Claims 15 and 17 were similarly amended though not objected to by the examiner. It appears that claim 16 was inadvertently included in the list by the examiner since it does no have the relevant language at all.

Item 13 – The examiner contends that the specification fails to disclose "a logfile of requested sites by a user". It is noted that this was in the patent application as originally filed. In particular it was in claim 1 of the original patent application in the paragraph beginning "said first proxy server programmed to receive a request from an HTTP client and register the request in a logfile of all web sites requested by a use".

Item 16 – The examiner objected to the fact that friendly and unfriendly lists are undefined. The specification has been amended at page 7 to define these terms. This clarification is supported repeatedly throughout the specification. For example, at the bottom of page 9 and continuing to page 10 the original disclosure stated:

> Before that happens, however, the request is first sent by the system to the first proxy server to be checked against the friendly or unfriendly list. If the proxy server simply checked the requests for approval and allowed through those requests that are from paid users who are supposed to get approved for access to the resources, then the resource web site's address

In addition, in the very paragraph being amended, it states that "A friendly list

means a list of preferred names of entities such as URLs or subsets of URLs" and that "An unfriendly list is a list of non-preferred names of entities such as URLs or subsets of URLs."

Finally, by implication, the specification, at page 10, when referring to a case that represents the <u>opposite</u> <u>configuration</u> result for a friendly list states that "users that paid for access to the premium highly sensitive documents ("approved users") and who should get approved for access are listed by their *trusted host name* in the proxy server's "unfavorite" or "unfriendly" inbound list." In computer science language, the term "host name" refers to the IP address. Thus, the case that represents the <u>normal</u> <u>configuration</u> result is where the IP address is approved for access and is therefore in the friendly list.

Item 17 -- To address the examiner's objections, the phrase "regular accounts with varying amounts of administrative privileges" has been replaced with "regular accounts with administrative privileges other than the privilege or power to create additional accounts or view information on any other accounts and regular accounts without administrative privileges" in all claims in which this phrase appeared. This is taken directly from, and hence is supported by, page 19 of the specification and was actually the original claim language (and was allowed). Certain claims in which this phrase did not appear, such as claims 9, 47, 103-114, were left unchanged though they were listed in item 17 as objectionable on this ground. It is respectfully suggested that this was done inadvertently by the examiner.

Item 18 -- Commas were added to claims 1, 5 and 41, as previously stated with respect to item 7, in the sentence "a second proxy server, without the administrative module or the friendly or the unfriendly lists, placed between the first proxy server and

the Internet" in the paragraph beginning "a second proxy ...". In addition, the words "
have been added to these claims 1, 5, 41.

Item 19 - claims 3, 62, 64-67, 72-73 and 97-98 have been amended to clarify that
"other" means other than the first and second proxy servers. This is inherent from the
specification which describes proxy chaining in which the highest numbered proxy server
is located between the next-to-highest proxy server and the (resource on the) Internet.
For example, the second proxy server is defined to be between the first proxy server and
the Internet. It is also supported at page 18 of the specification wherein it states that "it is
contemplated by the proxy chaining described herein that there can be a third proxy
server or even additional proxy servers that forward inbound requests for resources to
other proxy servers." This implies that such third proxy servers function as do the second
proxy server, which is defined to be between the first proxy server and the Internet. So
the third proxy server would be between the second proxy server and the Internet and
would forwards inbound requests for resources to third proxy servers, if such existed
exist.

Item 20 – claims 4, 23, 25, 27, 33, 38, 44 and 49 were amended to respond to the
examiner's objection by reciting that "the system is compatible with dialup modem
connection to the Internet, the system is compatible with a local area network and the
system is compatible with virtual network connection."

Item 21 – claims 5, 11 and 46 (the latter claim 46 was not objected to by the
examiner on this ground) were amended to fix the typo of "fist" to "first".

Item 22 – claims 63 and 71 were amended to address the examiner's objection
that "approved client" and "unapproved client" were not defined. Claims 80 and 84 were

–39–

similarly amended though the examiner did not mention these claims in this item. "Approved clients" were changed to "clients of approved users", the term "approved users" being defined at page 10, line 10 of the specification. Likewise "unapproved clients" was changed to "clients of unapproved users", the term being likewise defined in the specification at page 10 line 14.

Furthermore, the fact that page 10 of the specification is referring to clients (i.e. the computer) of approved users is supported on the same page of the specification at line 12 when it recites that "the proxy server bounces the <u>user' URL request</u>. The same thing for unapproved users at line 16. ("users who did not pay for premium access ("unapproved users") ...have their <u>URL request</u> approved"). It is inherent in the specification that the user uses his or her computer, meaning the client, to make the URL request.

<u>Prior Art Rejection</u>

The examiner rejected the claims based on Fuh. It is respectfully submitted that this is incorrect for the following reasons.

The examiner rejected all the independent claims, namely claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 41 and 46 (see item 25) based on the examiner's contention that Fuh discloses certain elements of the claims in the context of proxy chaining. The examiner bases his conclusion that Fuh teaches proxy chaining on his contention (see the end of item 25 of the Office Action) that "Fuh has both a firewall", which the examiner calls a "first proxy server", "and an authentication proxy", which the examiner calls "a second proxy server." In fact, as demonstrated below, Fuh does not in fact have a first proxy server and a second prosy server, does not teach proxy chaining and hence does not disclose the

—40—

elements of independent claims 1, 5 and 41 of the present invention in the context of proxy chaining.

Fuh's firewall router 210 is not a first proxy server. It is a router. A router is different than a proxy server. For example, a router is a computer networking device that inspects individual TCP/IP packets of information and tries to decide whether to send them. A router is transparent to the client. A router cannot process or understand HTTP protocol and therefore cannot understand the full complex URL. An HTTP proxy server, in contrast, does understand the full URL (HTTP protocol message) and is specifically configured for the client's browser.

In proxy chaining, a proxy server forwards a client request to a second proxy server. A proxy server is not transparent to the client; you configure your client to use that proxy server.

Although the authorization proxy 400 of Fuh may be called a proxy server, there is no proxy chaining disclosed in Fuh because the proxy 400 initiates communications with firewall router 210 in order to clear the cache of 420, 422 which is part of 400. In proxy chaining, in contrast, the proxy server is not aware of its client. A second proxy server would therefore never initiate communication directly to its client, the first proxy server.

In addition, in proxy chaining the nature of the communication is such that the proxy server simply forwards requests to the second proxy server and the second proxy server sends back the response of the web site. In contrast, Fuh's authorization proxy re-configures router 210.

A second reason why there is no proxy chaining from the firewall router 210 and

–41–

the authorization proxy 400 of Fuh is that in Fuh authorization proxy 400 asks router 210 to execute something and router 210 executes authorization proxy 400. Router 210 of Fuh activates and deactivates authorization proxy 400 so therefore 400 cannot exist without 210. In proxy chaining, in contrast, the starting and stopping of each proxy server is done by entities other than the proxy servers. The proxy servers' life cycles are thus independent of each other.

A third reason why there is no proxy chaining from the firewall router 210 and the authorization proxy 400 of Fuh is that no one except router 210 can use authorization proxy 400. Proxy 400 is hidden from any other entity. In proxy chaining, in contrast, other clients besides the first proxy server can use the second proxy server. Anyone can be a client of the second proxy server including the first proxy server.

Moreover, the router 210 of Fuh cannot perform user authentication whereas our first proxy server with or without the existence of a second proxy server.

Since Fuh, the prior art cited by the examiner does not disclose the elements cited by the examiner in the context of proxy chaining, it is respectfully submitted that Fuh does not provide a basis for rejecting independent claims 1, 5 and 41 of the present invention and any of the dependent claims that depend from these claims.

Since the independent claims are distinguishable over Fuh, the dependent claims of the present invention are necessarily also distinguishable over Fuh.

With respect to independent claims 7, 11 and 46, although these claims do not recite a second proxy server, they too are distinguishable over Fuh because the first proxy server of the present invention in claims 7, 11 and 46 is neither similar to the router 210 of Fuh nor to the authorization proxy 400 of Fuh.

The first proxy server in claims 7, 11 and 46 is not taught by the router 210 of Fuh for the reasons stated in the context of the proxy chaining – a router works at the network layer whereas the first proxy server can work at the application layer, the router is transparent to clients whereas the first proxy server is not transparent to clients, the router does not understand the client requested URL whereas the first proxy server does, the router supports client communication authorization whereas the first proxy server supports client access authorization, the router supports packet filtering whereas the first proxy server supports message filtering. In addition, 210 cannot perform authentication of the users whereas the first proxy server does perform authentication. In addition, router 210 of Fuh can only be based on a single user account unless 400 enables it to be based on multiple user accounts whereas the first proxy serve is based on a multiple user accounts.

In addition, the first proxy server of claims 7, 11 and 46 are not taught by the authorization proxy 400 of Fuh for several reasons. First of all, authorization proxy 400 cannot complete any task without the use of router 210 – it lives like a "parasite" of the router 210. In contrast, the first proxy server stands alone and is not dependent on anything to communicate between the client and the requested resource. Moreover, authorization proxy 400 of Fuh is transparent to the client and never forwards client request to the resources whereas the first proxy server of the present invention is not transparent to the client and does forward client requests to the resources or to the next proxy. Also 400 of Fuh executes within a very short period of time from the client to the router 210 for authentication purposes In contrast, the first proxy server is always actively participating in communication from the client to the resource and from the

—43—

resource back to the client.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art cited by the examiner does not provide a basis for rejecting independent claims 7, 11 and 46 not any of the independent claims. If the independent claims 7, 11, 46 are distinguishable over the prior then the claims dependent on these independent also are distinguishable.

Furthermore, the proposed amendments resolve the section 112 issues raised by the examiner, as demonstrated above.

Since all of the foregoing amendments are understood to place the application in condition for allowance, their entry is submitted to be appropriate and is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-30, 32-34, 37-39, 41-102, 115-124 are in condition for allowance and it is requested that they be allowed.

Payment of $525 for a response within the third month is provided through a credit card authorization form accompanying this amendment.

Dated: September 25, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Horowitz, Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,768
295 Madison Avenue, Suite 700
New York, NY 10017
(212) 867-6800

—44—